

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/784,445 | DEVOE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Melvin Curtis Mayes | 1734 | |

All Participants:

(1) Melvin Curtis Mayes.

(2) Kristi Davidson 44,643.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 14, 21 July 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1,31

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to amend Claim 1 and cancel Claims 31-43 to place the case in condition for allowance, specifically to make it clear in Claim 1 that the mandrel is separated from the wraps or ceramic tube depending on the sequence of separating and sintering.